

United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMER United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION N
10/050,941	01/22/2002	David Hall	15186-24US JA/AD/MB	3864
20988 7.	590 10/14/2004		EXAMINER	
OGILVY RENAULT			SMITH, RUTH S	
SUITE 1600	COLLEGE AVENUE		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
MONTREAL, QC H3A2Y3			3737	
CANADA			DATE MAN ED. 10/14/200	

DATE MAILED: 10/14/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

		Application No.	Applicant(s)	Applicant(s)			
Office Action Summary		10/050,941 HALL ET AL.					
		Examiner	Art Unit				
		Ruth S Smith	3737				
Period fo	The MAILING DATE of this communication ap or Reply	opears on the cover sheet with	the correspondence a	ddress			
THE - Exte after - If the - If NC - Failt Any	ORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REP-MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION nsions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1 SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. Period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reduction period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period received by the Status of the maximum statutory period reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by status reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailed patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	. 136(a). In no event, however, may a reply ply within the statutory minimum of thirty (3 d will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTH te, cause the application to become ABAN	be timely filed O) days will be considered time S from the mailing date of this DONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).				
Status							
1)⊠	Responsive to communication(s) filed on 20	August 2004.					
2a)⊠	☑ This action is FINAL. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.						
3)□	Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under <i>Ex parte Quayle</i> , 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.						
Disposit	ion of Claims						
5)□	Claim(s) 1-16 is/are pending in the applicatio 4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdred Claim(s) is/are allowed. Claim(s) 1-16 is/are rejected. Claim(s) is/are objected to. Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/	awn from consideration.					
Applicat	ion Papers						
10)	The specification is objected to by the Examir The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) acceptable and applicant may not request that any objection to the Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correct The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiration.	ccepted or b) objected to by e drawing(s) be held in abeyance ction is required if the drawing(s)	. See 37 CFR 1.85(a). is objected to. See 37 C	• •			
Priority (under 35 U.S.C. § 119						
12)□ a)	Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreig All b) Some * c) None of: 1. Certified copies of the priority documer 2. Certified copies of the priority documer 3. Copies of the certified copies of the pri application from the International Bure. See the attached detailed Office action for a list	nts have been received. Ints have been received in Appointy documents have been re au (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).	lication No ceived in this Nationa	l Stage			
Attachmen							
	e of References Cited (PTO-892) of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)	4) Interview Sum Paper No(s)/N	ımary (PTO-413) 1ail Date				
3) 🔲 Infor	mation Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08 or No(s)/Mail Date		mal Patent Application (PT	⁻ O-152)			

Application/Control Number: 10/050,941

Art Unit: 3737

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

Claims 1-7,10-13 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Chance in view of Levitt. Chance discloses a system and method of optical imaging using time and frequency domain measurements to evaluate medical conditions using light from a tunable laser, a plurality of wavelengths injected at one or more positions, switching to direct the light at a plurality of injection ports and detection at multiple positions. Chance fails to disclose the use of simultaneous detection at multiple wavelengths. Levitt discloses multiple simultaneous optical measurements. The measurements can be any type of time-domain parameter such as wavelength. The input signals may be light and the carrier signal may also be optical. It would have been obvious to one skilled in the art to have modified Chance such that the detection of the multiple wavelengths takes place simultaneously as disclosed by Levitt. The advantage of such is to reduce data acquisition time and provide more enhanced data as disclosed by Levitt.

Claims 8-9,14-16 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Chance in view of Levitt and Feng et al. Chance discloses a system and method

of optical imaging using time and frequency domain measurements to evaluate medical conditions using light from a tunable laser, a plurality of wavelengths injected at one or more positions, switching to direct the light at a plurality of injection ports and detection at multiple positions. Chance fails to disclose the use of simultaneous detection at multiple wavelengths. Levitt discloses multiple simultaneous optical measurements. The measurements can be any type of time-domain parameter such as wavelength. The input signals may be light and the carrier signal may also be optical. It would have been obvious to one skilled in the art to have modified Chance such that the detection of the multiple wavelengths takes place simultaneously as disclosed by Levitt. The advantage of such is to reduce data acquisition time and provide more enhanced data as disclosed by Levitt. Chance discloses optical detection using semiconductors devices but fails to disclose detection with a CCD camera and filtering. Feng et al disclose a system and method of optical imaging using time and frequency domain measurements of diffusion of photons using multiple wavelengths provided by a plurality of laser sources, switching between multiple injection ports, and detection with CCD camera and bandpass filter. It would have been obvious to one skilled in the art to have further modified Chance such that it employs the well known detection means as taught by Feng et al with the imaging device taught by Chance. Such a modification merely involves the substitution of one well known type of detection device for another.

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments filed 8/20/04 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive. Applicant's arguments are not understood in that Levitt was cited merely as a teaching that it is known to detect the multiple wavelengths simultaneously. As previously stated such a modification would reduce data acquisition time.

Conclusion

THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL. Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within

Art Unit: 3737

TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Ruth S Smith whose telephone number is (703) 308-3063. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 5:30 AM- 2:00 PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Brian Casler can be reached on (703) 308-3552. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Ruth S Smith Primary Examiner

Art Unit 3737